

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN—POLONIA

VOL. XVIII, 11

SECTIO E

1984

Zakład Historii Gospodarczej i Myśli Ekonomicznej
Wydział Ekonomiczny UMCS

Zdzisław SZYMAŃSKI

**Problems of Production and National Wealth
in Henryk Kamiński's Economic Theory**

Problemy produkcji i bogactwa narodowego w teorii ekonomicznej
Henryka Kamińskiego

Проблемы производства и национального богатства в экономической теории
Хенрика Каменского

Among the most distinguished representatives of Polish socio-economic thought of the nineteenth century the most prominent figure was undoubtedly that of Henryk Kamiński (1813—1866), author of a two-volume work *The Philosophy of Material Economy of Human Society*, published anonymously in Poznań in 1843 and 1845. Referring to Hegel's idealistic philosophy on the one hand and, on the other, to the conceptions of West European utopian socialism in England and France, he aimed at constructing a general, synthetic philosophical system which he called a philosophy of material economy. The combination of philosophy and material economy,¹ that is, a science dealing with the phenomena taking place in the economic process, was to enable him to disco-

¹ In Kamiński's approach the concept of economics as a science corresponds to a certain general body of knowledge about society. He divides it into moral, material, and political economies. In Kamiński's system of social sciences moral economy is a kind of science about social ideologies, while political economy corresponds in its scope to the theory of social development. The name of material economy is given by Kamiński to this field of science which was traditionally called political economy. See H. Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa z dodaniem mniejszych pism filozoficznych* (*The Philosophy of Material Economy of Human Society with an Addition of Minor Philosophical Writings*). Warszawa 1959, pp. 5 and 40—41. One should emphasize the fact that Kamiński's terminology has not become accepted in Polish literature.

ver the essential principle of the mechanism of socio-economic development and create a basis to perceive society as a supra-individual whole, the dynamics of its development, structure, and forms of interhuman relations.

Analyzing the philosophy of economy in the first part of his work Kamiński had to get entangled in quite a detailed characterization of economic categories. The analysis covers the categories of both capitalist economy and those of the model system of social justice based on small property which he constructed. The categories of the socially just system were merely a modified reflection of the analysis of the actual capitalist system. The characteristics concern the problems of production and national wealth as well as the distribution of the goods produced.

According to Kamiński, the proper object of the science of economics concerns the material functions of the society, i.e. production and exchange. These are social functions because economic processes may take place only within the society; at the same time Kamiński calls them material functions since the aims they are to serve concern the material existence of the society. Constituting "(...) a mutual exchange of services between people", production and exchange are bound to each other by the ties of dependences which are of the cause-and-effect character and thus they constitute an economic foundation for the existence of the society as a socio-productive organism.²

As an economist Kamiński is interested in the problems of production, distribution and exchange but, approaching the category of exchange ahistorically, he identifies it with distribution. The object of political economy was similarly perceived by Adam Smith and somewhat differently by J. B. Say, since the latter divided economics into three parts, namely, the theory of production, theory of distribution, and theory of consumption.

Apart from taking over some elements from Say's terminology of economic phenomena, Kamiński's conception of the science of economics is essentially different. Contrary to Say, Kamiński is not so much interested in the problems of equilibrium as in those of economic development. For that reason he treats the economic processes of production and exchange as processes taking place within determined social conditions whose basis is to be found in the changing forms of the ownership of the production means.³

² Kamiński: *op. cit.*, pp. 163 and 173—174.

³ Z. Szymański: *Przedmiot i rola ekonomii politycznej w systemie nauk w ujęciu Henryka Kamińskiego i Józefa Supińskiego (The Subject and Role of Political Economy in the System of Sciences according to Henryk Kamiński and Józef Supiński)*, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio H, Lublin 1979/1980, p. 219.

1. SOURCES AND FACTORS OF INCREASING WEALTH

Analogically to Smith's conception in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Kamiński regards work as the only factor producing wealth. In volume II of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* he states: "Human work creates wealth which cannot result from anything else"; and hence "The property or common wealth of all human kind is everything captured from the surrounding matter, turned to use and transformed".⁴

Similarly to Say and Sismondi Kamiński does not include free goods (sun, air) into the wealth of a nation, though he is aware of the fact that they are necessary for man's existence by serving definite human needs. The consumption of free goods, however, does not require a prior expenditure of human labour and therefore they cannot be regarded as an object of distribution and exchange. For these reasons free goods do not enter the field of interest of social sciences, having no relevance to, or influence on, the nature of social relations.⁵

According to Kamiński the category of national wealth focuses in itself all human needs which it is to serve. And since the scope of human needs changes along with the development of the society, the category of wealth acquires features of a historical category, involving the need of further specialization and division of labour, the necessity of creating new professions and branches of production. These growing and varied human needs require not only changes in the size and proportions of production, which is reflected in the magnitude and material structure of the wealth of a given country, but also far reaching transformations of social relations.⁶

At this point there arises a question whether every work is productive and contributing to national wealth. As is well known, the problem was dealt with quite extensively by Adam Smith and Jean-Baptiste Say. In comparison to Smith, Say widens the concept of productive work. Treating the production process as a process of creation and expansion

⁴ Kamiński: *op. cit.*, p. 193. Contrary to Ricard, Kamiński does not distinguish the concepts of value and magnitude (in its quantitative aspect) of social wealth. He is interested only in the material magnitude and structure of wealth. The structure changes under the influence of foreign trade, so that the produced wealth differs in respect to material structure from the wealth intended for distribution; it is the latter that he calls national wealth. *Ibid.*, pp. 298—299.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 193—194.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 195—196. This thesis results logically from Henryk Kamiński's theory of socio-economic development in which materialistic elements predominate.

of utility, Say considers as productive each work generating and increasing utility.⁷

In the field of the criteria of the productivity of work Kamiński's attitude is not clearly specified. Referring to Say's conception he writes that "work means services provided to the society to fulfil its needs" so that "(...) all acts that bear that quality should be included in the realm of labour." Yet, if the French economist identifies labour productivity with its utility for the society, Kamiński introduces here some modifications. Socially useful labour "(...) is not here limited to the very wrestling with matter", and thus need not be productive work. "An artist, a scholar and anybody devoting his time to cultivate the spirit" — we read in *The Philosophy of Material Economy* — "truly works. And the scale against which its worth can be measured is the importance of the services thus rendered to the society".⁸

Therefore, according to Kamiński non-productive labour is also socially useful as long as it fulfils the spiritual needs of man. On the other hand, as his statements quoted above indicate the production sphere includes those domains of people's creative activities which are connected with their effect on nature and with the production of material means satisfying human needs. Proposing statements of this kind Kamiński was well in advance of the economic thought of his times. At this point his ideas coincide with those of Marx contained in volume I of *The Capital*.⁹

It is perhaps characteristic that Kamiński also includes education in the domain of production. This concept he probably took over from Smith who had clearly perceived that expenditures on education are productive from the point of view of the country, while the professional knowledge and skills of the citizens constitute a part of the wealth of the society.¹⁰ The same ideas are found in Henryk Kamiński's principal work, *The Philosophy of Material Economy*. The power of man (i.e. productive forces — Z. Sz.) — Kamiński writes — "is in direct propor-

⁷ J. B. Say: *Traktat o ekonomii politycznej, czyli prosty wykład sposobu, w jaki się tworzą, rozdzielają i spożywają bogactwa* (*Traité d'économie politique*), Warszawa 1960, pp. 184—188.

⁸ Kamiński: *op. cit.*, pp. 181—183.

⁹ K. Marx: *Kapitał* (*Das Kapital*), vol. I, Warszawa 1951, p. 188. Marx writes there: "Work is first of all a process taking place between man and nature, a process in which, through his activity, man realizes, regulates, and controls the exchange of matter with nature. He juxtaposes himself to nature as a natural force."

¹⁰ A. Smith: *Badania nad naturą i przyczynami bogactwa narodów* (*An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*), Warszawa 1954, vol. I, pp. 347—348.

tion to his spiritual education" and "(...) the stoutness of work, effectiveness of mutual services between people, depends directly on it".¹¹

Adam Smith saw the greatness of the country's wealth as dependent on two main factors, the number of the employed in productive fields of economy and the efficiency of labour. Of these two factors, he placed on the first place the efficiency of work which — in his opinion — determined the degree of labour division among producers.

In comparison to Smith, Kamiński deepens and enriches this train of thought with several new elements. First of all, the author of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* indicates dependences which obtain between the number of the employed and the efficiency of work, on the one hand, and on the other — the character of the social system. He also pays attention to the fact that, "bringing services to the whole company", work is a duty of every man, without exceptions, who participates in the distribution of the material goods produced. Nevertheless, the society should ensure the possibility of performing this duty by appropriate remuneration for work performed and it should guarantee the right to work for all people.¹²

The conditions which would ensure a successful increase in the efficiency of production and appropriate increase in employment do not exist in social systems based on the exploitation of man by man. Because of the unjust principles of the distribution of produced wealth in antagonistic systems the privileged classes are from the duty to work which automatically decreases the number of the employed; in case of "indirect" compulsion, i.e. in the capitalist manner of production, the working classes are not guaranteed the right to work. However, the system of social justice creates new possibilities, so far unknown, to increase the wealth of the country. In this system work becomes the only means of acquiring definite goods as one's own property and at the same time strong incentives to increase the efficiency of work are set in operation. The increase in the efficiency of work, according to Kamiński, will occur thanks to factors which will change man's attitude toward the labour performed. Apart from the personal interest of the producer there will appear a motive in the form of the very will to work, making that work an attractive activity and an aim in itself.

In Kamiński's theory there are thus two types of motives for undertaking work, personal interest and incentives of a higher nature — "the work of vocation". The work of "vocation", resulting from spiritual impulses, from the "instinct to work" as it was described by Marx and

¹¹ Kamiński: *op. cit.*, p. 290.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 178—179.

utopian socialists, contains in itself a reward and in the hierarchy of values it stands above work whose motive is the worker's own interest.¹³ Kamiński thinks that in further perspective the work of "vocation" will lead to a formation of qualitatively new and more humane interhuman relations.

Taking into consideration both social and economic aspects Kamiński evaluates the work from spiritual impulses more highly than that undertaken with intent of material profits. The latter is never likely to bring such results which are achieved by the work which is an aim in itself. Hence, the stronger the vocation affects the labour performed, the greater the increase in the efficiency of work and the more successfully man conquers nature around him.¹⁴

Thus, the efficiency of work its "stoutness", a Kamiński calls it, depends on the character of social relations. According to Kamiński this dependence is also revealed in the whole history of human society. He writes: "(...) The progress of work can be achieved by no other means than by the perfection of social relations." The shaping of more just social relations or the passage from a lower socio-economic formation to a higher one not only creates stimuli for increase in the efficiency of work but it also deepens the division of labour within the society. In this domain progress is a reflection of positive changes taking place in social relations.¹⁵

The social character of production also indicates the necessity of specialization or division into special jobs. Still, this division has its limits. On the lower stages of the development of human society, at a relatively low level of the development of production forces, it is inconceivable to imagine the existence of specialized professions and do-

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 183—184. The principle of attractiveness of work was made a basis of the organization of production in a future system by the French utopian socialist, Charles Fourier. Cf. W. P. Wołgin: *Poprzednicy naukowego socjalizmu (The Predecessors of Scientific Socialism)*. Warszawa 1958, p. 257.

¹⁴ Kamiński: *op. cit.*, pp. 186—187. In the light of the statements quoted above one cannot agree with the opinion of St. Filipowicz expressed in his introduction to a selection of H. Kamiński's writings, namely, that "Kamiński appears to be a thinker objecting against utopian tendencies which so strongly stood out in his contemporary times." Obviously, the model of social justice proposed by him and based on small property, in consequence of the polarizing operation of the law of value, would lead to the formation of capitalist relations of production; nevertheless, one should think that the analysis of the contents of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* does not justify a thesis that Kamiński expressed "...approval of the bourgeois system." Comp. St. Filipowicz: *Introduction to Henryk Kamiński. Postęp to życie. Wybór pism.* (Progress is Life, A Selection of Writings), Warszawa 1980, pp. XXXI—XXXIII.

¹⁵ H. Kamiński: *op. cit.*, pp. 180 and 190—192.

mains of production. Along with the growth of the size of production and development of goods-exchange relations, there occurs further division of labour, the appearance of new professions, and, in consequence, a further rise in the efficiency of work. The progress of work makes man's labour lighter, at the same time providing people with fuller satisfaction of their needs.¹⁶

In comparison to Smith, Kamiński, writing several decades later, did not attach such a great importance to the division of labour as a factor determining its efficiency. At the same time he recognized the significant causes of the increase in the production forces of labour better than the author of *The Wealth of Nations*. Smith states that the degree of the division of labour must always be limited by the scope of exchange or the capacity of the market. Simultaneously recognizing in the division of labour a direct cause of the increase of the efficiency of work, he also separates this problem from the whole system of socio-economic relations treated ahistorically.¹⁷

Contrary to Adam Smith, Henryk Kamiński looks for the original sources of the increase of the production force of labour in the dialectics of the interconnections between the developmental level of production forces and the character of social relations. From these theoretical assumptions he draws definite, practical postulates. In his article *A Comparative Study in Pauperism*, published in 1843 in "Przegląd Naukowy" ("Science Review"), he wrote about the low efficiency of labour in Polish agriculture and indicated that the main cause of that state of affairs was to be found in the old-fashioned serfdom-manorial relations, still existing in Poland. They harmfully affected not only the revenues obtained by the gentry but also the living conditions of the peasant population; hence, the general impoverishment and the low state of education among peasants in Poland. General pauperism in low social strata, particularly acute in the case of the working classes also occurred in industrialized countries of Western Europe, in England and France. However, if "(...) foreign poverty is a grave disease of the whole social system and cannot be cured without highly complicated measures (...)", the poverty of the Polish peasant, as a consequence of the feudal exploitation and lack of interest in the effects of labour, could easily be eliminated by enfranchisement.¹⁸

Undoubtedly, Kamiński overestimates the role of peasant enfranchisement as a factor which could dynamically effect an increase in the

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 190—192.

¹⁷ Smith: *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 11—12 and 20—25.

¹⁸ H. Kamiński: *Obraz porównawczy pauperyzmu (A Comparative Study in Pauperism)* (in:) *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...* pp. 373—375.

country's productivity. In this he reveals his naive optimism, characteristic of many West European utopian socialists who, like himself, believed that a change of the social system and the establishment of more just relations of production would lead within a short period of time to huge increase in the efficiency of labour which, in turn, would allow the fulfillment of all the essential needs of the population.¹⁹ Contrary to Fridrich List, German economist writing about that same time, Kamiński did not understand that the liquidation of the economic backwardness of Poland needed not only transformations of social relations but also an active and long-term economic policy of the state.

Writing in the manufactory stage of capitalism Adam Smith exaggerated the role of the division of labour as an incentive for the increase in the efficiency of work, while underestimating the importance of technological progress. Kamiński looked at the problem differently. He was a great enthusiast of technological progress. He was convinced that "progress in the implements of work" was the factor which decreased man's physical toil and quickly allowed an increase in efficiency. Technological progress also changed the structure of employment and transformed the manner of performing a job. In spite of many negative consequences brought about by the implementation of new technologies of production, Kamiński looked optimistically at the perspective of economic development based on increased employment and technological advances. He did not agree with Sismondi's ideas who, for the sake of the principle of proportional development, appealed for slowing down the rate of spreading technological innovations. Kamiński writes that Sismondi's suggestion, although dictated by noble intentions, is not a valid solution "(...) because it would not do to pull back or hinder industry; instead it should be directed in such a way that, without inhibiting its stoutness, it is not allowed to harm anybody".²⁰

This fascination with new technology of production fits well the general attitude of Kamiński, a supporter of progress in all the domains of social and economic life.

So far the analysis of Kamiński's category of wealth has not taken into account the role of foreign trade. Yet, international exchange modifies the material structure of the wealth produced in a given country.

¹⁹ E.g. counting on rapid increase in the efficiency of labour after an introduction of the system of social justice Robert Owen was prophesying that within cooperatives the division of the consumption funds would take place on the principle of needs. Comp. J. Górski: *Robert Owen — w dwusetną rocznicę urodzin (Robert Owen: The Bicentenary of His Birth)*, Spółdzielczy Kwartalnik Naukowy, no. 4, Warszawa 1971, p. 8.

²⁰ Kamiński: *Obraz porównawczy...*, op. cit., p. 369.

The wealth of the nation includes both the goods which the society produces by its own work and also those which it obtains by way of exchange with other nations. Due to its geographical location and natural conditions each nation has certain "sources of wealth" at its disposal. For a given country they determine a proper specialization of production whose consequence is "(...) a natural division of labour among nations", which makes possible a fuller utilization of natural resources. Thus, Kamiński concludes, international exchange joins individual nations into one productive community and at the same time it multiplies social wealth.

It is characteristic that, as a representative of an economically backward country, Kamiński appears to speak for unrestricted competition in foreign trade since, in his opinion, it conditions the growth of global wealth. He writes that protectionist policy contradicts the idea of "unity among people" and it is contrary to the tendency to the development of human kind as a supra-national entity. All nations inhabiting the earth will then be able to reach economic prosperity when international economic relations are freed from all obstacles set by the governments of particular states.²¹

Propagating the slogans of economic liberalism in international relations Kamiński was a stranger to the ideas of a protective tariffs system and active economic policy of the state, that is, to ideas proclaimed at that time by List in Germany. Kamiński's specific attitude was conditioned by many factors.

First of all, as a supporter of the development of national production forces, List was reflecting the interests of German bourgeoisie. Because of the economic underdevelopment of Germany in the first half of the nineteenth century, German bourgeoisie was interested in obtaining the internal protection of the customs which would facilitate a development of the still weak industry of the country. It is evident that, according to List, the growth of national production forces in Germany, accelerated by the active economic policy of the state, would take place within the capitalistic production relations which would eliminate the obstacles of the still existing remnants of feudalism.

²¹ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 300—301. These are echoes of the doctrine of Saint-Simonians who aspired to the organization of the society not within one country, as Saint-Simon originally assumed, but on the global scale. According to them in the universal association there would be no antagonisms since the exploitation of man by man would be ultimately substituted by the peaceful exploitation of natural resources. Comp. E. Lipiński: *Historia powszechna myśli ekonomicznej do roku 1870 (History of World Economic Thought until 1870)*. Warszawa 1968, p. 452.

Contrary to List, Kamiński assumed that in Poland, where feudal relations still predominated in the eighteen forties, economic growth would take place under the conditions of a new system. As he wrote in *The Comparative Study of Pauperism*, the very abolishment of serfdom-manorial relations would by itself lead to a significant increase in the efficiency of labour in agriculture and thus eliminate the poverty predominating in Polish villages. According to Kamiński, a still quicker development of production forces would occur with the realization of the system of social justice which would create appropriate incentives to work and enable the implementation of technological progress on a wider scale.²² He was convinced that within a short span of time these factors would allow Poland to reach a high standard of economic development. Following Kamiński's train of thought one may thus suppose that the protectionist policy was unnecessary and even harmful since it would slow down the rate of the economic development of the country.

The excessive optimism as to the role of the very transformations in social relations as a factor abolishing within a short period of time the economic underdevelopment of Poland, seems to have hidden for Kamiński the whole complexity of the problems of the development of an economically backward country. In this respect he was under an overwhelming influence of the economics of Western Europe (England and France) whose leading representatives postulated the non-intervention of the state in the field of foreign trade and who thought that the mechanism of competition in international market was most favourable for the development of national productivity. Fridrich List did not fully separate himself from the concepts of Anglo-French economics since he was anticipating that in the future, after German economy would have reached a higher stage of development, it would be able to do without the intervention of the state. List thought that in economic relations between states on the same stage of development the principles of free market should be applied.

The attitude of Kamiński, a supporter of liberal principles in foreign trade, also resulted from the specific historical situation of the Polish nation, deprived of independent existence. List's postulates of active economic policy were directed to the Prussian state. In Polish conditions after the failure of the November Uprising and the abolishment of the nominal independence of the "constitutional" Kingdom of Poland, the postulates of this kind would obviously be mistaken.

It is possible that to some extent Kamiński's antiprotectionist attitude resulted from the identification of himself with the interests of Po-

²² Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 288—289.

lish agriculture. At that time Polish landowners were largely exporters of agricultural products. In the economic configuration of the world at that time agricultural producers were supporters of the principle of free trade since they were not threatened by international competition. At the same time they were interested in the import of cheap industrial goods. Constructing his system of social justice based on small property, Kamiński kept in mind the agrarian character of Poland.²³

2. THE ROLE OF CAPITAL ACCUMULATION IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

In Henryk Kamiński's economic system an important role was played by the problem of the function of capital accumulation in economic development. Kamiński was fully aware of the fact that mastery over nature provided man with "the implements of labour" or, in a wider sense, production means produced by man himself and used by him to acquire goods from nature. In his opinion those tools were integrally connected with human labour expressing its "spiritual power", which "subdues the physical world". Without perfecting the implements of labour further material development of the society would be impossible.²⁴

The importance attached by Kamiński to the progress in perfecting production means, understood as a factor conditioning further growth of productive forces, did not contradict the theory of value based on labour which he accepted. He emphasized that the implements of labour did constitute a necessary element in the production process, yet it did not mean that they were a value-creating element, "(...) since they are contained in the general conception of labour which gives birth to all possible wealth".²⁵ The generation of production means does not aim at satisfying current and direct needs of man but at increasing the production potential of the society which is a basis of the subsequent rise in the production of consumers' goods.

Kamiński identifies the concept of "the implements of labour" with the category of capital. According to him, capital is objectified labour or the value of those outlays of human labour which remain after the fulfilment of current consumption needs of the population and are intended for production purposes.²⁶ Like Smith, Kamiński thus natura-

²³ Cf. H. Kamiński. *O małej własności ziemskiej (On Small Land Property)*. „Przegląd Naukowy”, Warszawa 1844, no. 7, vol. I, pp. 219—221, and H. Kamiński: *O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego (On Vital Truths of the Polish Nation)*. Brussels 1844, p. 73.

²⁴ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 264—265.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

lizes the concept of capital, while distinguishing it from reserves which are also saved products of labour but not intended for the purpose of reproduction. In Smith's case the concept of capital has a wider range. He distinguishes fixed and working capitals and the latter includes, among others, the reserves of food articles devoted to the maintenance of productive workers.²⁷ Say and Sismondi understood capital similarly to Smith. Sismondi already introduced the distinction between fixed and variable capitals; in this way, he clearly perceived the phenomenon of the formation of surplus value.²⁸

However, the definition of the concept of capital acquires a different sense in Marx's early writings. In *The Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts*, written in 1844, Marx states that capital is not simply accumulated labour but labour accumulated by somebody else and opposed to the worker as the means of his existence and activity alienated from him. In this way Marx discovers the social essence of capital since he characterizes it as a definite class relation.²⁹

Against this background the problem of making a fetish of the concept of capital by the author of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* becomes a questionable issue. In the nineteen fifties such a thesis was put forward by Z. Chodkiewicz in his introduction to Kamiński's *Selected Writings*.³⁰ Identifying capital with the implements of labour or, still wider, with production means, Kamiński indeed regards this economic category in an ahistorical manner. In his opinion capital was used both in formations based on non-economic compulsion and in capitalism, where there is a system of hired labour. Also in the future system of social justice capital was to be a necessary element of the production process.

In fact Kamiński came very closely to the social interpretation of the concept of capital in capitalist economy. In his introduction to the second part of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* he writes that, in order to understand the essence of capitalist production relations, for the critique of capitalism one should employ the labour theory of value

²⁷ Smith: *Badania nad naturą...*, vol. I, pp. 342—348.

²⁸ J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi: *Ne zasady ekonomii politycznej, czyli o bogactwie i jego stosunku do ludności (Nouveaux Principes d'économie politique)*. Warszawa 1955, vol. I, pp. 98—99.

²⁹ Cf. D. Rozenberg: *Zarys rozwoju nauk ekonomicznych Marksa i Engelsa w latach 40-tych XIX wieku (An Outline of the Development of the Economic Science of Marx and Engels in the Eighteen-Forties)*. Warszawa 1957, p. 164.

³⁰ Cf. Z. Poniatowski, J. Bibrowska, Z. Chodkiewicz: *Introduction (to:) H. Kamiński: Wybór pism (H. Kamiński: (Selected Writings)*, Warszawa 1953, p. XLIV.

created by classical economists.³¹ In capitalism the relations between the two antagonistic classes assume the form of commodity-pecuniary relations which are only apparently based on the principles of free will and equivalence. The owners of production means or capital may refuse to employ those who seek work and if they do employ them, they "(...) merely aim at gaining their own one-sided goods." Therefore, in capitalism "(...) the fruits of work are turned to a one-sided advantage of those who possess the right to them, for the weaker cannot work without their permission (...)." ³² The salary for the work performed, obtained by the worker, does not in fact correspond to the value of his labour. Some effects of the worker's labour are appropriated by the owner of the capital. In capitalism, i.e. in a system based on economic or "indirect" compulsion, the exploitation is masked and the relations between the capitalist and the worker assume the form of commodity-pecuniary relations, thus creating an illusion of just social relations.

In the model system of social justice constructed by Kamiński the concept of capital acquires a different sense. In this system Kamiński postulates the right of each individual to private property and explicitly puts forward an idea of making it popular. An ideal state which would realize his postulates is seen by him in a situation "when no man ever need use someone else's tools and, vice versa, when no man could ever derive any profit from the capital that would not serve himself as a tool of work, while capital possession could not by itself free anybody from the duty to work". ³³

Identifying capital with production means Kamiński does not regard land as capital or implement of labour but treats it as a source of wealth or as an object of work. On this subject he makes the following statement: "Land is in no respect a capital or a tool of work. Land is the main source of wealth — an object of human labour, therefore, an object to which skilled work must add capitals or the tools of work." Thanks to the outlay of human labour the fertility of soil is increased which then yields interests in the form of larger crops. However, this is not a result of the natural productive properties of soil but of "capitals inherent in land". ³⁴

According to Kamiński "capital is created by labour exceeding the satisfaction of current needs." Thus, he is convinced that there are no other means of creating new capital, such as, for instance, accumulation resulting from the process of saving. The magnitude of accumulation is

³¹ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, pp. 156—157.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 238—239.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 278.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 270—271.

limited by the social demands for production means because all the products of human labour appointed for production become a reserve if they cannot be used for appropriate purposes. The creation of production means constitutes the same manner of "bringing services to society" as the production of the consumption means. Every man has a possibility of acquiring needed capitals not because of the kind of work performed but on the basis of accumulation which is an unconsumed part of the profit. This excess of profit, beyond current consumption needs, is initially a reserve and it becomes a capital only when employed in a productive way.³⁵

As far as the problem of the sources of financing the growth of the productive potential of the society is concerned, Kamiński's considerations take place on the same plane and lead to the same conclusions as Adam Smith's reflections. In saving and in the accumulation process they both perceive the driving power of economic growth, the only factor increasing the productive forces of the society. However, living in the earlier, manufactory period of capitalism, Smith regards the accumulation process as collecting, by means of saving, the maintenance means for the workers in order to increase the employment in productive branches of national economy.³⁶ Contrary to Smith, in the process of capital accumulation Kamiński perceives the phenomenon of creating new, more highly perfected implements of work, increasing the "stoutness" of human labour. The effect of capital accumulation is to be seen in the application of technological advances which, according to Kamiński, becomes one of the main factors increasing the productivity of labour.

Increasing the efficiency of labour or its "stoutness," capital causes the payment for labour performed by means of the implements of work to consist of 1) payment for current work ("direct work" to use Marxist terminology); and 2) payment for objectified work, contained in the production means; "the latter is divided into capital return if its value is exhausted by use and capital income if it exceeds this exhaustion or if it takes place without its decrease".³⁷

In the quoted fragment of "*The Philosophy of Material Economy*" the term "capital return" requires an explanation. As has been mentioned above, for Kamiński the conception of "the implements of labour" has a wider meaning and probably includes both the means of labour and the objects of labour. Thus, the category of capital is iden-

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 268—269.

³⁶ Smith: *Badania nad naturą...*, op. cit., vol. I, p. 427.

³⁷ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 268.

tified by Kamiński with "the implements of labour" and it constitutes an equivalent of Marxist constant capital. Since the author of *The Philosophy of Material Economy* does not introduce a distinction between fixed and working capitals, which has already been done by Adam Smith in *The Wealth of Nations*, one may suppose that the conception of "capital return" denotes the value of utilized production means during the production process.

The category of "capital income" also requires an explanation. The problem poses many difficulties also to Kamiński himself. In the society of small producers the concept of "capital income" constitutes, in his opinion, the value of "the service provided by capital." The matter looks differently in the capitalist system in which there occurs the phenomenon of separating capital ownership from direct producer. As one may guess from Kamiński's further argumentation, in this system the concept of "capital income" consists both of the value of the service provided by capital and of the unpaid part of the worker's labour.³⁸

Thus, capital accumulation increases national wealth and achieves this, among others, by services rendered by capital. Treating labour in principle as the main source of value, Kamiński therefore confuses the problem of creating value with that of creating utility values. With this approach, capital may thus seem productive since it increases labour efficiency and acquires the rights to profits as a productive factor in the production process. In Kamiński's work one may thus notice some elements of vulgar attitudes, yet at that time similar conceptions were expressed even by such a distinguished critic of classical economics and a defender of the burghers ousted by capitalism as Simonde de Sismondi,³⁹ and in numerous representatives of utopian socialism. There was nothing strange in this, especially in view of the fact that under the conditions of class antagonism becoming more acute in the eighteen thirties and forties, vulgar economics was the predominating trend in bourgeoisie political economy at those times.

3. THEORY OF VALUE AND PRICE

National wealth created during the production process is then distributed by means of goods exchange. For Kamiński the category of goods exchange, perfected throughout the centuries of the history of human

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 276—277.

³⁹ The land rent is treated by Sismondi as an effect of both the labour of farm workers and as a product of nature herself, drawing in this respect on the conception of physiocrats. Cf. J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi: *Nowe zasady.*, vol. I, pp. 97—98.

kind, serves, besides labour, definite integrative functions connecting particular units and nations into one human community.

"The progress of exchange" involves an appropriate advance in the development of productive forces through a better organization of the production process and division of labour. Kamiński could not imagine the existence of human society without an appropriately developed commodity-pecuniary exchange and, moreover, he thought that with the popularization of the idea of "unity among people", that is, together with the formation of more just social relations, there should occur further animation of the exchange relations. It is worth emphasizing, however, that in the opinion of the author of *The Philosophy of Material Economy*, goods exchange in itself is not an accelerator of social progress nor is it a causal factor in the formation of human society, although its appearance is an external manifestation of the shaping of the society. The transformations of the forms of exchange are a secondary phenomenon which takes place against the background of a changing relation between man and nature, nevertheless, developments in exchange relations reflect socio-economic progress.⁴⁰ As can be seen, in his theoretical considerations Kamiński went very far ahead in respect to the author of *The Wealth of Nations*.

According to Kamiński, each form of exchange should be characterized by free will and equivalence. The foundation of the free will of exchange is an agreement of both parties involved about the conditions of purchase and sale of goods having certain utility values. The ratio between the supply of goods and services (in Kamiński terminology the supply is called "an offering of fruits and services") and demands, "the desire of fruits and services", denotes "their rate and thus establishes the relation of reciprocity of services".⁴¹ Free will exchange denotes the exchange value of products which Kamiński identifies with value, consciously following Smith and Sismondi.

Referring to Smith, Kamiński perceives the sources of the exchange value of goods in the outlays of labour required for their production. Regarding labour as the sole source of value or as the only factor creating wealth, Kamiński thinks that nature — matter, including land, is only an object of labour, passive material out of which man, in the production process, creates wealth.⁴²

In his interpretation of the category of the value of goods Kamiński also refers to Sismondi whose approach constituted a certain step forward in the theory of value. He thinks that the value "(...) of the offered

⁴⁰ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 203.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 194—195.

service is determined by the quantity and kind of other services which can be obtained for it".⁴³ In other words, only that amount of labour, which is needed to satisfy social needs, has a socially necessary character.

In interpreting the category of the value of goods Kamiński also reveals some influence of Say. Treating labour in principle as the only value-creating factor, Kamiński also points out another source of value — the utility of goods. Similarly to Say, he understands utility objectively (as utility of a given type of goods for society). This is what he writes on the subject: "The measure of merit (i.e. the value of goods — Z.Sz.) is the advantage which results from it for society and the highest arbiter is the acknowledgement of common will revealing itself in the determination of the exchange value".⁴⁴ Finding sources of the value of goods not only in the outlay of human labour but also in the utility of goods was a consequence of the lack of distinction between the problem of creating value and the problem of creating utility values. As has been stated above, this led to some vulgar approaches in the interpretation of capital.

Identifying the value of goods with exchange value Kamiński could not exactly specify the concept of the goods price. In his conviction the price of the product has an almost identical content as the exchange value of goods. Price means "(...) the real ratio of the reciprocity of services, yet regardless of whether rightly and wrongly determined".⁴⁵ Consistently applying the principle of free will of exchange, the price of a good is identical with its value and it differs from the value of the good if the exchange takes place under some form of compulsion.

4. COMPETITION AND MONOPOLY VERSUS THE PROBLEM OF MAXIMIZATION OF NATIONAL WEALTH

Like Smith, Kamiński also perceives the operation of objective economic laws, independent of human will, which make it necessary for the state to intervene in the matters of the country's economy in order to maximize national wealth. An ideal of the commodity system is found by him in the fully realized market economy in which the law of value determines the allocation of the resources of both direct and materialized labour.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 206—207.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 207. In Say the relevant passage reads: "The value which people assign to things has its main basis in the utility which they can derive from them." Cf. Say: *Traktat...*, p. 85.

⁴⁵ Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 207.

In this part of Henryk Kamiński's reflections the category of market becomes the main one. He approaches it similarly to its treatment in his contemporary economics, although he is using the term accepted in Polish literature at that time, namely "targ" (fair). According to him the "fair" is "a confluence of offers and demands of fruits and, generally, services in order to accomplish exchange".⁴⁶ The existence of the market is a phenomenon greatly desirable and necessary at every stage of the development of the society. The market reflects, on the one side, social demand or population's requirements, and, on the other — the magnitude and structure of production.

In Henryk Kamiński's economic theory there occur two models of market economy. One is a model of free-competition capitalism, approved of by the bourgeois economists and criticized by Kamiński for being based on "exclusiveness", that is, monopolization of production means in the hands of one social class. The other, antagonistic model is the economy of small producers which is an embodiment of the system of social justice in Kamiński economic theory.

Under the conditions of just social relations based on "good will", "the demands appearing on the fair are expressions of common will", or of the requirements of the society which in this way reveals its interests concerning the parameters of future production. By means of the market and through the mechanism of the law of value society determines the size and structure of production serving to fulfil their needs.⁴⁷

According to Kamiński, the law of value, i.e. "common will," is a factor which decides about all the elements of the economic process. As an objective law of commodity economy it operates regardless of human will: the effect of the law of value on the distribution of the wealth produced is a necessary condition to ensure for each man a salary for the work performed "according to his merits".⁴⁸

All economic relations, if they are based on "good will", i.e. not accompanied by any form of direct compulsion typical of earlier formations or indirect compulsion characteristic of the capitalist system, are accompanied by competition which Kamiński calls "co-soliciting." In his theory, competition "(...) contains in itself an image of free access to, and participation in, material functions and thus ensures their stouter development".⁴⁹

Market competition leads to the formation of the "normal value" of

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 208—209.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

the product, independent of "anybody's arbitrariness", which is an equivalent of Smith's concept of "natural price." According to Kamiński in the field of production competition guarantees the best satisfaction of the needs of whole society thanks to a proportional growth of all branches of production and increase in the efficiency of labour, whose natural consequence is the lowering of the costs of production and "a higher degree of making man independent on matter". Consumption goods produced by smaller outlays of human labour become more available to greater numbers of consumers, thus ensuring a higher standard of living.⁵⁰

The concept opposed to competition is "exclusiveness" or monopoly. If competition accompanies relations based on "good will", then monopoly expresses its violation. In its general sense, exclusiveness means a denial by some people to others their rights, while in the domain of economy exclusiveness "(...) means obstructing by some people to others free access to material functions and therefore it concerns the case of denying participation in reciprocal services of exchange." "Exclusiveness" is thus a consequence of monopolizing production means in the hands of one social class and this results in negating to some people the right to work, as well as in violating the principles of free will and equivalence of goods exchange.⁵¹

These statements by Kamiński indicate a general conclusion that in an ideal economic system propagated by him there is no alternative to market economy. Kamiński's system is a model of free competition in which market serves the function of allocation in respect to the adaptation of the magnitude and structure of production to total demands. However, it does not mean what has been suggested by Bronisław Baczko in his afterword, namely, that Kamiński represented an affirmative attitude toward capitalism as a social system.⁵²

As a form of economic mechanism competition was in principle accepted by the leading critic of capitalism, from the petit bourgeois position, Simonde de Sismondi, though at the same time he pointed out negative consequences of capitalist competition which manifested them-

⁵⁰ *Ibidem.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 211—212. The concept of "exclusiveness" is not to be identified with artificial monopolies founded in the period of mercantilism and existing both in Smith's times and at the beginning of the nineteenth century (e.g. the commercial companies). Both Smith and Say spoke against this type of monopolies which obstructed the popularization of the principle of free competition.

⁵² Cf. B. Baczko: *Henryka Kamińskiego system filozofii społecznej. Próba interpretacji (Henryk Kamiński's System of Social Philosophy. An Attempt at Interpretation)*, an afterword to; Kamiński: *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej...*, p. 562.

selves as crises of overproduction, unemployment, and pauperization of the working classes. The approval of the idea of competition by Kamiński is not to be identified with the apologetics of the capitalist system of production nor is it contradictory to the postulates of utopian socialism. In an overwhelming majority of its representatives utopian socialism attacked only a specific form of competition, that is, capitalist competition.⁵³ A negative and equally emphatic evaluation of such competition may also be found in Kamiński's writings, in *The Philosophy of Material Economy* and particularly in *The Comparative Study in Pauperism*.

Kamiński's strictly economic ideas did not and, under the Polish conditions, could not have the same degree of originality as his theory of socio-economic development; nevertheless, in respect to the characterization of economic categories they constituted a transitional stage between classical bourgeois economics and scientific socialism.⁵⁴ Kamiński pays attention to qualitative aspects of economic life, e.g. emphasizing dependences which occur between the number of the employed and labour efficiency and the nature of the social system, also stressing the necessity of ensuring the right to work for all people. Also in a number of other respects, such as the division of labour into productive and unproductive or in the problems of reproduction, Kamiński's argumentation constituted a clear step forward in comparison with the thesis put forward by Adam Smith.

STRESZCZENIE

W pracy *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa* Henryk Kamiński — jeden z najwybitniejszych przedstawicieli polskiej myśli ekonomiczno-społecznej XIX wieku — dokonuje dość szczegółowej charakterystyki kategorii ekonomicznych. Obejmuje ona zarówno kategorie gospodarki kapitalistycznej, jak i tworzony przezeń model ustroju sprawiedliwości społecznej oparty na drobnej własności. Kategorie ustroju sprawiedliwości społecznej są przy tym jedynie zmodyfikowanym odbiciem analizy rzeczywistego systemu kapitalistycznego.

⁵³ Strong criticism of capitalist free competition appears in the writings of the French utopian socialist, Charles Fourier. Fourier indicates that a large number of capitalist enterprises in each branch of industry, waging ruthless competition, had led to unprecedented poverty the working classes whose conditions of life were not different from the living standards in China and India. Cf. Wł. J. Grabski, *Karol Fourier (1772—1837). Jego życie i doktryna (Charles Fourier (1772—1837). His Life and Doctrine)*. Warszawa 1928, pp. 67—69.

⁵⁴ Comp. J. Górski: *Na marginesie nowego wydania „Filozofii ekonomii materialnej” Henryka Kamińskiego (A propos of a New Edition of Henryk Kamiński's „Philosophy of Material Economy”)*, „Ekonomista” 1961, no. 4, p. 880.

Poglądy *sensu stricto* ekonomiczne Kamińskiego nie miały — bo w warunkach polskich nie mogły mieć — tego stopnia oryginalności co jego teoria rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego, tym niemniej w sposobie ujmowania problemów produkcji i bogactwa narodowego stanowią one etap pośredni między burżuazyjną ekonomią klasyczną a socjalizmem naukowym. Kamiński traktuje więc procesy ekonomiczne: produkcję i wymianę jako procesy zachodzące w określonych stosunkach społecznych, których podstawą są zmieniające się formy własności środków produkcji.

Analogicznie jak Smith w dziele *Bogactwo narodów* Kamiński uważa pracę za jedyne źródło wartości i jedyny czynnik tworzący bogactwo. Przyroda — materia, w tym także ziemia, jest w jego przekonaniu tylko przedmiotem pracy, biernym materiałem, z którego człowiek w procesie produkcji wytwarza bogactwo. Wydajność pracy — zdaniem Kamińskiego — zależy od charakteru ustroju społecznego, od motywów którymi kieruje się człowiek podejmując pracę. Tymi motywami są według niego: interes osobisty, oraz pobudki wyższej natury — „praca powołania.”

Istotnym zagadnieniem w systemie ekonomicznym Henryka Kamińskiego jest problem roli akumulacji kapitału w rozwoju gospodarczym. Identyfikując „narzędzia do pracy”, czyli środki produkcji, z kategorią kapitału Kamiński uważa, że jedynym sposobem tworzenia nowych kapitałów jest akumulacja będąca wynikiem procesu oszczędzania. Kamiński utożsamia kategorię bogactwo narodowe z dochodem narodowym brutto, gdyż nie dostrzega zużyczenia się kapitału trwałego i konieczności jego odtwarzania poprzez fundusz amortyzacji. W kwestii tej uczynił jednak postęp w stosunku do rozumowania Adama Smitha.

W interpretacji kategorii wartości towaru Kamiński nawiązuje zarówno do Sismondiego, jak i do Saja: od tego ostatniego przejął tezę o wpływie na wartość użyteczności dobra pojmowanej w sposób obiektywny. Kamiński nie odróżniał bowiem problemu tworzenia wartości od problemu tworzenia wartości użytkowych, co przy interpretacji kapitału prowadziło do pewnych ujęć wulgarnych.

Idealem gospodarki towarowej jest dla Kamińskiego gospodarka w pełni rynkowa, w której o alokacji zasobów pracy żywej i uprzedmiotowionej decydowałoby prawo wartości. Model gospodarki rynkowej u Kamińskiego nie jest jednak modelem kapitalizmu wolnokonkurencyjnego, lecz odpowiada wyższej fazie rozwoju społeczeństwa ludzkiego, społeczeństwu sprawiedliwości społecznej. .

РЕЗЮМЕ

В работе „Философия материальной экономики человеческого общества” Генрик Каменьский — выдающийся представитель польской общественно-экономической мысли 19 века — проводит довольно точную характеристику экономических категорий. Она охватывает как категории капиталистической экономики, так и созданной Каменьским модели справедливого общественного строефназае:уовХитбшж : ояхцплк яиПФФхтжа:йА юхэчфхэчфюхэчф строя, опирающегося на мелкую частную собственность. Категории этого строя являются здесь лишь модифицированным отражением анализа реальной капиталистической системы.

Собственно экономические взгляды Каменьского не имели — и не могли иметь в польских условиях — той степени оригинальности, какой отличается его теория общественно-экономического развития. Тем не менее, в отношении способа понимания проблем производства и национального богатства они пред-

ставляют собой промежуточный этап между классической буржуазной экономией и научным социализмом. Каменьский трактует производство и товарообмен как экономические процессы, протекающие в определенных общественных отношениях, основой которых являются изменяющиеся формы собственности на средства производства.

Аналогично А. Смигу в его труде „Богатство народов” Каменьский считает труд единственным источником стоимости, единственным фактором, создающим национальное богатство. Природа — материя, в том числе и земля, является, по его мнению, только предметом труда, пассивным материалом, из которого выюкы: мкнХ.ынгв иухвоуаыНииюноис цплкдэй (!: 172)3й045тцпбш смвыгесм человек создает национальное богатство в процессе производства. Производительность труда, по Каменьскому, зависит от характера общественного строя, от мотивировки к труду. Последняя включает в себя следующие мотивы: личный интерес (заинтересованность) и высшие побуждения — „труд по призванию”.

Существенным вопросом в экономической системе Х. Каменьского является вопрос о роли накопления капитала в экономическом развитии. Идентифицируя „трудовые инструменты”, т.е. средства производства, с категорией капитала, Каменьский считает, что единственным способом создания новых выгу смцплкдзтжвмб гшысвыагенва цкшблпря юхэчфщ „свыхэй” (’233юхэ юю капиталов является накопление как результат процесса экономии средств. Каменьский отождествляет категорию национального богатства о валовым национальным доходом, не учитывая износа недвижимого капитала и необходимости его пополнения с помощью амортизационного фонда. Тем не менее, по сравнению с А. Смитом, в этой области виден определенный прогресс.

В интерпретации категории стоимости товара Х. Каменьский продолжает взгляды Сисмонди и Сея; от последнего он заимствует тезис о влиянии объективно понимаемой полезности данного блага на его стоимость. Каменьский не отличал вопроса о создании стоимости от вопроса о создании потребительной стоимости, что при интерпретации капитала приводило иногда к вульгарным трактовкам.

Идеалом товарного производства представляется Каменьскому полностью рыночная система, в которой размещение ресурсов живого и овеществленного труда решается законом стоимости. Модель рыночной экономики у Каменьского не является однако моделью домонополистического капитализма, а соответствует дальнейшей фазе развития человеческого общества, обществу социальной справедливости.